

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 8-39 are now pending in the application. Applicant cancels claims 4 and 7 without disclaimer or prejudice to the subject matter contained therein. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 8-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Alexander et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6289267). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Alexander is directed generally to monitoring various characteristics of a low-frequency electrical system. In particular, Alexander monitors characteristics such as current and voltage in order to determine electrical load and other system parameters. However, Alexander does not disclose several aspects of the claims as alleged by the Examiner.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite “collecting historical data on the parameters, defining at least one condition for at least one parameter based on the historical data, and modeling physical outcomes in accordance with selected parameters” and “applying a set of rules to the at least one condition to determine a state of operation of the power delivery system.” Alexander does not teach or disclose these limitations. For example, the Examiner asserts that Alexander discloses “defining at least one condition for at least one parameter based on the historical data” at column 2, lines 38-48. The Examiner also asserts that Alexander discloses “modeling physical

outcomes in accordance with selected parameters” at column 4, lines 30-42. Applicant has reviewed the cited art and respectfully submits that the cited section completely fails to discuss these elements.

MPEP § 2131 states that “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). MPEP § 2131 also specifies that, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the...claim.” (Emphasis added). *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Applicant respectfully notes that the Examiner’s assertions with respect to the limitations set forth above do not satisfy these criteria. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner review the portions of Alexander upon which the Examiner relies as anticipating these features and clarify how the cited sections do so. In the alternative, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner cite alternate portions of Alexander that anticipate these limitations or withdraw the rejection of claims including these limitation.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as well as its corresponding dependent claims, is now in condition of allowance.

Applicant amends claim 10 to recite “applying the set of rules to the parameters to predict a future state of operation of the power delivery system.” Alexander does not disclose such a limitation. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10, as well as its corresponding dependent claims, is now in condition of allowance.

Applicant amends claim 31 to include limitations analogous to claim 10, which Applicant believes to be allowable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 31, as well as its corresponding dependent claims, is now in condition of allowance.

Claim 20 recites “communicating at least one of the plurality of parameters to a remote site; monitoring the plurality of parameters associated with the power delivery system and communicated to the remote site; and providing a database at the remote site for storing the plurality of parameters communicated to the remote site.” Alexander does not disclose such a limitation. In particular, Alexander does not disclose a database at a remote site for storing the plurality of parameters. At best, Alexander discloses a remote terminal. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 20, as well as its corresponding dependent claims, is in condition of allowance.

Applicant respectfully notes that Alexander fails to anticipate other claim limitations. For example, claim 5 recites “utilizing one of a fuzzy logic system and a neural network system to define the at least one condition.” Claim 7 recites “providing an expert system to receive the rules and the at least one condition, wherein the expert system indicates a failure mode criteria.” Applicant has searched the entire text of Alexander and did not find any reference to “fuzzy logic”, a “neural network”, an “expert system”, or “failure mode criteria”. Therefore, Alexander can not anticipate or disclose these limitations.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests

that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Mar 5, 2004

By: 
Joseph M. Lafata, Reg. No. 37,166

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

JML/DMA